

R E M A R K S

Claim 4 was withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim as stated in the Office Action.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, namely the shaft having a smooth form must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s) as mentioned in the Office Action. A new sheet of drawing with a new Figure 3 is presented to show the shaft in an accompanying Request for Drawing Correction Approval, subject to the approval of the Examiner.

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Greenway (US Pat. 5,649,349) in view of Hickey (US Pat. 4,136,296) on the grounds set forth in the Office Action.

In respect to claim 1 Greenway (US 5,649,349) discloses in the description of the prior art that the central openings 16 of the laminations 10 are often disposed and therefor the consecutive laminas 28 of the motor cores 26 are rotated by 180° to eliminate or significantly reduce any parallelism error. Greenway discloses furthermore as his invention to use different kinds of laminas called standard laminations 35 and truing laminations 40. The standard laminations 35 comprise a central opening or shaft hole 42 of the same size (col. 4, lines 43-45). The truing laminations 40 include a central truing opening 44 which is slightly larger than the shaft hole 42 (col. 4, line 46 f). So two different laminations 35, 40 are required and the laminations 40, 45 are turned 180° in relation to one another. In contrast

present claim 1 requires that the laminations are turned in relation to one another by at least one pole pitch. Greenway does not teach in his invention to arrange the location bores of the armature lamination eccentrically to execute his invention.

He furthermore teaches the problem of different thickness of the laminations. This problem is solved by tuning the laminations or lamina stacks by 180°. So Greenway does not teach the matter of present claim 1. Furthermore the person skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Hickey's description of the prior art with Greenway's invention since Greenway discloses a complete solution and the person skilled in the art would not search for alternatives since they are not required.

In respect to claim 2 the Examiner fails to show where Hickey describes a motor shaft of a smooth form. Why should the motor shaft comprise a smooth form for the purpose of holding the laminations under pressure? If the motor shaft is in an unsmooth form, the laminations are pressed against the shaft and the shaft and the laminations are slightly deformed under the radial pressure so that the laminations cannot move relative to the shaft. So Hickey does not describe a smooth shaft.

So neither claim 1 nor claim 2 is shown in or suggested by the teachings of Greenway or Hickey, alone or in combination.

New claim 6 differs from claim 1 in that claim 6 does not recite the motor shaft as a positive element of the rotor, but states only that the armature core is configured for receiving a motor shaft. New claim 7 is similar to claim 6 but requires the differential amounts of rotation between armature laminations to be equal to the pitch of one pole, which pole pitch is less than 180 degrees.

Deposit Account Charge forms are presented in the amount of \$84.00 to cover the Government fee for one extra independent claims in excess of 3 independent claims.

In the event there are further issues remaining the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone attorney to reach agreement to expedite issuance of this application.

All of the claims are believed to be allowable in view of the foregoing argument.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification by the current amendment. The attached pages are captioned "Version with markings to show changes"

Since the present claims set forth the present invention patentably and distinctly, and are not taught by the cited art either taken alone or in combination, this amendment is believed to place this case in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the matter, enter this amendment, and to allow all of the claims in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
Hans-Jürgen Johann, et al

by: MARTIN A. FARBER
Attorney for Applicants
Registered Representative
Registration No. 22,345

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR SECTION 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that the accompanying Amendment, Deposit Account Charge and Request for Drawing Correction Approval are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents & Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on August 28, 2002.

Dated: August 28, 2002

MARTIN A. FARBER

866 United Nations Plaza
Suite 473
New York, NY 10017
(212) 758-2878